From: **Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US**
Sent: 7/25/2012 4:35:11 PM

To: "Tom Wilber" <wilberwrites@hotmail.com>
CC: "seneca.roy@epa.gov" <seneca.roy@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Dimock follow

Tom,
I cut and pasted your questions here and provided EPA's responses below each one. -- Terri
1. I know aresenic barium and manganese are naturally occuring. They can also be associated with drilling that creates pathways for them to move into water supples. Barium is also a common constituent of drilling mud. Given the concern and questions over the impact of shale gas development on water supplies, does the EPA plan to evaluate the source of elevated contaminated levels in the five wells?
EPA Response: EPA's goal was to provide the Dimock community with complete, reliable information about the presence of contaminants in their drinking water and determine whether further action was warranted to protect public health. We have now completed sampling and an evaluation of the particular circumstances at each of the 64 homes included in our assessment. This sampling and evaluation did not demonstrate situations that present a health concern or give EPA a reason to take further action. In the few instances where we found levels of arsenic, barium or manganese that could potentially present a health concern, residents have or will have treatment systems capable of reduced levels at the tap.
2. Given that water systems are dynamic and changing, and drilling operations move around, is there any chance that other water supplies might be affected in the future? Does the possibility of this make it necessary to isolate a cause?
EPA Response: EPA's goal was to provide the Dimock community with reliable information about the presence of contaminants in their drinking water and determine whether further action by EPA was warranted to protect public health. At this time, EPA is not looking to identify potential trends regarding drinking water quality in Dimock.
3. Will the Dimock results be taken into account in the EPA's national re-revaluation of the safety on fracking on groundwater, due out at the end of the year? If so, is there further analysis that has to be done with the Dimock case? In addition to Pavillion Wyoming, What other communities are part of this evaluation?
EPA Response: In late January and early February 2012, EPA collected well water samples from 12 homes for isotopic methane analysis. EPA's initial approach to sampling at Dimock was to model our sampling plan after the sampling plan being used by EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) for their national study on hydraulic fracturing. The samples collected for this analysis were collected concurrently with those for other analyses.
The isotopic methane data is used to help determine the various locations in the substrata where methane originated. Having such information available for evaluation and interpretation should help the Agency determine whether methane found in drinking water aquifers is native to those aquifers or has possibly migrated to those locations from the deeper subsurface. EPA has no plans to conduct additional isotopic methane analyses in Dimock. Interpretation of these results is complex and beyond the scope of Region III efforts in Dimock. EPA Region III has provided all of the data to EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) for incorporation into the national hydraulic fracturing study. For more information about the national hydraulic fracturing study http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy/

From: Tom Wilber <wilberwrites@hotmail.com>
To: Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/25/2012 02:57 PM
Subject: Dimock follow

Hi Terri,
Thanks for sending me the press release on the Dimock water investigation.
A few questions.
I know aresenic barium and manganese are naturally occuring. They can also be associated with drilling that

creates pathways for them to move into water supples. Barium is also a common constituent of drilling mud. Given the concern and questions over the impact of shale gas development on water supplies, does the EPA plan to evaluate the source of elevated contaminated levels in the five wells?
Given that water systems are dynamic and changing, and drilling operations move around, is there any chance that other water supplies might be affected in the future? Does the possibility of this make it necessary to isolate a cause?
Will the Dimock results be taken into account in the EPA's national re-revaluation of the safety on fracking on groundwater, due out at the end of the year? If so, is there further analysis that has to be done with the Dimock case? In addition to Pavillion Wyoming, What other communities are part of this evaluation?
Many thanks
Tom Wilber
Shale Gas Review